

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action and the personal interview conducted on September 11, 2006, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 1-5, 7-28, and 30-59 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 29 have been previously canceled. New claim 60 has been added without adding any new matter.

Claim 51 was again rejected under 35 U.S.C. ¶101 for not being directed toward statutory subject matter, although the claim had been previously amended, making the rejection moot. The Examiner should withdraw this rejection.

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 15, 18-39, 42-50, 51 (30-35), 51 (44-49), 52, and 53-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Saylor *et al.* (US 6792086) in view of Maes (U.S. 6,088,669). Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor and Maes in view of Beyda *et al.* (U.S. 6,487,277). Claims 16-17, 40-41, and 51(40-41) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saylor and Maes in further view of Woods *et al.* (U.S. 6,510,417). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

First, the Examiner rejects the arguments directed at claims 53, 55, and 57, arguing that the claims do not recite “speaker dependent models that are updated without the use of a training phase” (see paragraph 2 on page 2 of the outstanding Office action). Clearly, the Examiner is misreading the claims, as those claims specifically recite that the speaker dependent models are updated *without* the use of any training phase. Thus, the Examiner must reconsider this argument for the patentability of those claims.

Furthermore, the claims all recite the use of user-specific speech models, which are adapted to specific users, as was discussed at the previously conducted personal interview. The Examiner recognizes that Saylor does not teach any such models, and thus cited Maes for such a teaching. However, the current independent claims, which recite a plurality of interactive voice response applications, recite that “each of said interactive voice response applications includes

an executable component for execution by said hosting system, said executable component comprising at least one of an executable file, a Java Bean, a Corba-component, a compiled software module, and a pre-compiled software module". None of the cited references teach the use of such an executable component.

The Examiner appears to argue that a teaching of the use of XML also teaches the use of executable components. This is not the case. XML (eXtensible Markup Language) is a general-purpose markup language that allows users to define their own tags, and its primary purpose is to facilitate the sharing of structured data across different information systems, particularly via the internet. It is used to encode documents and serialize data. However, it does not customarily include executable components. Accordingly, merely teaching the use of XML is not sufficient to anticipate the cited claim elements, and thus the claims are patentable over the reference.

Finally, new claim 60 is patentable for both of the above discussed reasons, and the dependent claims are patentable over the reference(s) for at least the same reasons discussed for their parent claims.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the a personal interview between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney is requested to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. P&TS-33226.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: / Robert F. Bodi /  
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Ste. 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

October 30, 2007